DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 187 185 HE 012 585

AUTHOR Whitehead, John S.
TITLE The Danish System Revisited.
INSTITUTION Yale Univ., New Haven, Conn. Inst. for Social and Policy Studies.
SPONS AGENCY Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, New York, N.Y.
REPORT NO YHERG-43
PUB DATE Mar 80
NOTE 23p.
AVAILABLE FROM Higher Education Research Group, Institution for Social and Policy Studies, Yale University, 1732 Yale Station, New Haven, CT 06520.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Access to Education; College Faculty; College Graduates; *Educational Change; *Education Work Relationship; Federal Legislation; *Foreign Countries; *Governance; Governing Boards; Government Role; Government School Relationship; *Higher Education; Institutional Autonomy; Labor Market; Open Enrollment; *Power Structure; School Community Relationship; Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS *Denmark

ABSTRACT

The paper is a supplement to an earlier paper in the same series which reviews Danish higher education until 1977. Expansion in higher education in the last 20 years, approaching the scale of mass higher education, culminated in a crisis in 1977. At that time, a trend toward self-government and participatory governing boards was seen as the end of traditional autonomy of the university. Twenty months later there was little of the earlier talk of altering the 1973 law that had caused these changes; in fact, that law was regarded as the established way of doing things. The crisis of the 1970's seems at an end, although one problem remains: the job market and its ability to absorb the graduates. While the crisis is foreseen, little has been done to plan for it, and it is not known when the problem will become serious. At the moment the strategy is to watch and wait. A significant result of this history is that for the first time in Denmark there is a sense that what happens outside the universities will affect what goes on inside them. In this case intellectual life has continued at a high level despite the decline in the traditional university autonomy. Therefore it may be possible for the historic organization of higher education to change naturally with the times. (Author/MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED187185

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Yale Univ

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HE 012 585

HIGHER EDUCATION RESEARCH GROUP

Institution for Social and Policy Studies

YALE UNIVERSITY

New Haven, Conn. 06520

2

THE DANISH SYSTEM REVISITED

by

John S. Whitehead

YALE HIGHER EDUCATION RESEARCH GROUP
WORKING PAPER

YHERG-43

March 1980

John S. Whitehead
Associate Professor of History
University of Alaska, Fairbanks

The research reported in this paper has been part of the work conducted by the Yale Higher Education Research Group. It has been supported by research funds from the Mellon Foundation for the comparative study of academic organization and governance.

In the interest of fullest possible circulation of information and ideas, the Higher Education Research Group reproduces and distributes these Working Papers at the request of authors who are affiliated with the Group. The views expressed are those of the authors.

A list of the Working Papers of the Group may be obtained from the address below.

Higher Education Research Group
Institution for Social and Policy Studies
Yale University
1732 Yale Station
New Haven, Connecticut 06520

Preface

The following article, "The Danish System Revisited," should be read as a supplement or follow-up to my previous article, "Danish Higher Education: Expansion, Crisis, and Institution Building," Yale Higher Education Research Group Working Paper 32. For those who have not read that paper a brief introduction to the state of affairs in Denmark up until 1977 appears below. This review should make it possible to comprehend the changes described in the present article.

Over the last twenty years, and particularly in the decade since 1968, the system of higher education in Denmark has undergone a dramatic expansion and change. It has expanded from a system serving an elite portion of Danish society to one approaching the scale of mass higher education. It has also changed from a system in which all decision-making was controlled by professors or chairholders to one in which decision-making has been spread to all ranks of faculty, students, and even technical personnel. These groups now govern the universities through a system of institute, study and faculty boards with an overall university council or Konsistorium and a rector as the head of the university.

The expansion began in the late 1950's and continued into the 1960's. Expanded economic prosperity sparked a quantitative increase in students, faculty, and new institutions. For example student entry into the system grew from 8,300 (13% of the 19-year old cohort) in 1960 to 20,000 (27% of the cohort) in 1975. There was also an element of idealism in this expansion. Many Danes wanted to try educational experiments with inter-disciplinary studies and other programs which would provide a new variety to what seemed a rather rigid and lengthy university curriculum. Plans were made for new kinds of institutions to be called "university centers" where traditional university faculties would be merged with other disciplines

(e.g. engineering and business) which had hitherto been offered in separate institutions. The university centers would also offer a new interdisciplinary "basic course" which would allow a student to choose from a number of different specialties leading to different careers as he or she progressed in his or her education. Two such university centers were opened at Roskilde in 1972 and at Aalborg in 1974.

By that time other events had occurred which brought great changes to the system. Student rebellions in 1968 led to demands for wider participation in university governance as well as other changes in the institutions' internal structure. As a result of these rebellions, the Parliament passed higher education acts in 1970 and again in 1973 which ended the exclusive rule of the professors and provided the new decision-making bodies mentioned above. In this restructuring, "institutes" (e.g. English Institute, Nordic Institute, etc.) replaced the old professorial chairs as the principal units of academic organization.

Under this new participatory system of governance young Marxist intellectuals, both students and teachers, made attempts to "takeover" the curriculum of certain institutes, and in some cases of entire institutions. This Marxist action was coupled with further student strikes in the 1970's. As a result the state intervened in the management of some institutions, and the control of the universities became a political issue. The most dramatic state intervention took place at the leftist-oriented Roskilde University Center. In 1975 the Parliament placed the institution under the control of three external rectors thus suspending self-government at Roskilde. Parliament also considered closing the institution altogether.

These events formed the backdrop for my first visit to Denmark in the fall of 1977. At that time there was a considerable reaction among some academics at what was perceived as a "crisis" in Danish higher education.

It was reported that some professors had withdrawn from active participation in unversity life. Others professed a desire to "exit" their universities and to pursue their research activities outside the higher education system. Some people complained that the new participatory governing boards consumed vast amounts of time leading to a decline in the quality of intellectual work. And there were those who felt the system had been hopelessly politicized; the interest shown in the universities by the Parliament, the political parties, and the press spelled the end of the "traditional autonomy of the university."

Despite this pessimism by some, other people saw signs of progress. Many felt that the new organization was clearly taking time to effect, but that it was bringing new skills to both students and faculty. Others saw the new system bringing people together with common institutional goals in contrast to the old system where professors had allegiance only to their chair. Quite a number of people were willing to agree that the crisis was more organizational than intellectual and that cohesive institutions were being built where previously only loose confederations of scholars had existed.

Though the new university center at Roskilde was still in some danger of collapse in 1977, the university center at Aalborg was much more stable and was beginning to achieve the goals of interdisciplinary studies and experimental education which the planners had envisioned.

In short, it was my prediction at the time that despite the elements of crisis, the Danish system was headed in the direction of stability. In the summer of 1979, I returned to see what had developed in the space of two academic years. That report follows as "The Danish System Revisited."

THE DANISH SYSTEM REVISITED

The "crisis" in Danish higher education and the controversy surrounding it which had caused such concern in the autumn of 1977 appeared to be only memories by the summer of 1979. In an interval of only 20 months topics of conversation and concern had dramatically changed. No longer was there talk of altering the Higher Education Act of 1973 nor was there a fear that Roskilde might be closed. Most people noted simply that the re-organization of 1970-73 was now the established way of doing things--the exception being at Roskilde which will be noted later. Also there was little fear expressed about "takeovers" of the curriculum of any department. At Copenhagen some "moderate" students felt that the leftist student organization controlled a disproportionate share of the seats on some of the governing boards thus giving a leftist push to the development of some curricula. This, however, was seen not so much as a "takeover", but as a result of better organization by the left in a student body in which apathy was the general rule. Only 34% of the students at Copenhagen participated in the elections for the governing boards.

More contrasts were evident in this short interval of 20 months. In the fall of 1977 some faculty members acknowledged that a few of their colleagues were bitter about the changes or feared a decline in curricular quality. There was little mention of such faculty reaction in the summer of 1979. Even if some people disagreed with changes in a particular curriculum their concern was not with a decline in quality but often quite the opposite--the curriculum had been made so demanding that students could not finish it in the designated time. The participatory governing system which had been criticized in 1977 as a time waster no longer seemed to be a source of contention. Nor was there any particular objection by faculty members to the student-faculty-staff proportions on the boards. Erik

Hansen at Aarhus noted that almost no one in his institute would want to go back to the old professorial rule; in hindsight, most could see that the expansion of the English Institute at Aarhus from 100 to 800 students in the 1960's was too much for the old professorial model to handle.

Though few people wanted to return to the old order, there was concern by some with the increasing involvement of national governmental bodies in the affairs of the universities. The pattern of 'benign neglect' which characterized that relationship before 1970 definitely seemed over. Along with budgetary cuts dictated by the Parliament and the Ministry of Education has come an increasing questioning of the universities by these public bodies--particularly along the lines of why university activities cost so much. Some faculty members have resented the establishment of national advisory boards in different disciplines to give information to the ministry--a policy which was beginning to cause concern in 1977. But few saw such bureaucratic interest as a sign that legislative changes were on the way. And quite a number of people felt that some academics exaggerated this expanding interest of the ministry and Parliament. At a party given by the Moderate Students League to celebrate the 500th anniversary of Copenhagen, the rector mentioned that there was a need for all factions in the university to unite against the state bureaucracy much in the manner that political parties had united against the Germans in World War II. But many students reacted to the speech saying that the rector had little to say if that was all he could talk about. In fact, the topic of greatest conversational interest concerning the Ministry of Education, was the travail of the recent Social Democratic Minister of Education, Ritt Bjerregaard, who was asked to resign by the Prime Minister because of sensational newspaper stories regarding the expenses she ran up at the Ritz Hotel in Paris while attending a European convention.

If a crisis in Danish higher education, either intellectual or organizational, existed in the summer of 1979, it was difficult to get anyone to say so. In fact, conversation at the older universities of Copenhagen and Aarhus was just the opposite. These traditional universities which were so dramatically altered by the legislation of the early 1970's seem to have adjusted well to the new organization. But what of the new university centers at Roskilde and Aalborg which began their existence under new forms. How have they fared?

Roskilde

In the fall of 1977 there was still a fear that Roskilde might be closed by the Parliament--though most people were beginning to feel that a small majority in Parliament would save it. By the summer of 1979 such fears were a thing of the past. Roskilde would survive--but the form in which it would survive was still in question.

Though the passions of earlier years have subsided, the state has not seen fit to remove the external rektorat under which it had placed Roskilde in 1975. In fact, the state has now placed that external board even closer to the Ministry of Educaton. In 1977 an external rektorat of three individuals was resident at Roskilde, but this was replaced in January, 1979, with a board of five persons resident in Copenhagen. In addition to this change more of the experimental organization of the institution has been altered.

Originally Roskilde had not been organized along the institute model used at the traditional universities, but around three interdisciplinary faculties--natural sciences, social sciences, and humanities. Each of these faculties offered a project-oriented two-year basic course. After the first two years students could choose from a number of specialized

study programs to complete the candidatus degree. These faculties have been abolished and replaced with nine institutes representing traditional academic disciplines. Though the academic organization was changed, the two-year basic courses were retained, but with no unified academic unit from which to receive teachers or support funds. Thus the co-ordinator of a basic course must now persuade two or three institutes to provide teachers and support. And the institutes can withhold co-operation. The institutes have not tried to abolish the basic courses, but with their greater emphasis on research and their own specialized degree programs they have prescribed prerequisities for future work which must be taken in those first two years. They have also attempted to "tame" the project-oriented curriculum by making certain courses required with a given project. Previously students involved in a project would elect only courses which seemed relevant to the given project. As a result of the new institute organization, one of the two basic years is now filled with specific requirements. Thus the interdisciplinary component of the basic course has essentially been compressed into one year.

The situation at Roskilde has certainly not remained static since 1977, but why has there been no continuing crisis--no continuing protest to the loss of institutional autonomy or the replacement of the interdisciplinary faculties with the more traditional institutes?

Professor Thomas Webb, a former rector who has been at Roskilde since its inception, noted that the present "quiet" atmosphere stemmed in part from the fact that many faculty members were still "stunned" to some extent by the events of the past. In the beginning few people thought that their right to direct the affairs of Roskilde could or would be challenged from the outside. It had not occurred to them that political or social opinions which were tolerated as individual expressions or even

as political movements would not be tolerated by the larger society as the expression of an educational institution. Thus the outside reaction to take away Roskilde's autonomy and possibly even to close the institution came as a surprise.

Webb felt that the leftist sentiment was now less vocal than in the past but that the ideological commitment was still there--now with a more realistic attitude as to how to survive. He went on to say that most faculty perceived that the innovative institution they had tried to create had been restricted and that concessions had been made to a more traditional curriculum. But most felt there was enough of the old institution left to salvage. The faculty mood was definitely not one of atonement for the way they had directed affairs in the past. Instead, the tone was now one of sober reflection about a future course of action.

The precise direction of that future action was unclear in the summer of 1979. Equally unclear was the future composition of Roskilde's student body. Webb pointed out that of those students who had entered in 1977, many who did not list Roskilde as their first choice, had dropped out. Some of these drop-outs have been replaced with students who took their first years at another university and then moved directly to degree programs at Roskilde's institutes, bypassing the basic course.

Thus the prospect could emerge of an institution with a transient student population composed of those using Roskilde as a waiting room to enter another institution or as a finishing school for degree programs begun at other places. Such a picture would offer little semblance of institutional stabilty at Roskilde--in fact, it might well argue that the physical plant simply become a suburban campus of Copenhagen University.

At the moment Roskilde's physical survival may not be at stake, but its distinctiveness as an institution certainly is. From the beginning the

center's distinctiveness was ideological. Its proximity to Copenhagen soon persuaded both teachers and students who did not share this interest to avoid the institution or to exit it after a short while. This geographical force still seems to be at work. Unless Roskilde is somehow different from Danish society at large, one can well wonder what could be done there which could not be done better 20 miles away in Copenhagen. What other kind of student culture or faculty culture would want to be drawn away from the metropolis? Geography works against Roskilde's development as a small university with traditional academic values; ideology may still be the best key to the future. Will those people--both students and faculty--with a leftist ideology be able to mold Roskilde into an institution which approaches university instruction in a fashion different from that of society at large, but which is nonetheless tolerable to that society? Can a small ideologically centered university on the outskirts of the metropolis survive in Denmark? At the moment the answer is not all clear.

Aalborg

In the fall of 1977 Aalborg appeared well on the way to institutional stability, but there were still questions to ponder. Would its new programs--particularly the project-oriented curriculum in engineering--maintain their innovative approach or be pulled back into a traditional mold. And could the institution attract and keep sufficient numbers of students and faculty. At that time some students feared that Aalborg was too new and innovative to guarantee them a job upon graduation. And some faculty viewed Aalborg as simply too remote in location to be a permanent base for an academic career. In fact the institution had been forced to attract faculty from Sweden to offset the reluctance of Danes to come.

In the summer of 1979 Aalborg could again be described as stable and growing. One striking aspect of this stability was the re-election as rector of Sven Caspersen, the man who had held the post in 1977. Caspersen's re-election obviously led him and others at Aalborg to have pride in the accomplishments of the past and optimism about the future.

The rector admitted that the university was still unable to attract students in sufficient numbers. While students from the city of Aalborg were easily attracted to the university, those from neighboring regions of Northern Jutland still did not view Aalborg as a "university city" in the fashion of Aarhus or Copenhagen. To increase the university's attractiveness--both within the region and nationally--the current plan is to develop "monopoly" courses so that Aalborg will be the only place in Denmark offering such instruction. Currently interdisciplinary programs have been organized in fisheries technology and in the study of developing countries. Both programs attempt to link engineers and economists together. In the latter case such people who may work in the developing country are exposed to the culture and language of the area. In the fisheries program the university work is heavily connected with the local fishing industry of Jutland. In addition to these two programs Aalborg has established an interdisciplinary program in music therapy to aid handicapped persons; this is the first such program in Scandinavia. More programs are planned for the future. In most cases the goal is to be interdisciplinary thus emphasizing the innovative nature of a university center.

The development of the faculty has taken an interesting turn at Aalborg. Caspersen noted that it is still difficult to attract older professors--particularly in the social sciences where lucrative consulting contracts might not be forthcoming in Aalborg. But in the arts and humanities Aalborg has had dramatic success without the aid of older professors. A group of younger

scholars, many of whom admitted that they came to Aalborg because there were no jobs anywhere else, have found the isolation and "pioneer spirit" invigorating. Gunhild Agger, a teacher in Danish literature, noted that to attract students to her courses, she had been forced to explain her discipline for the first time. And in regard to research she noted that scholars at Aalborg had to be more aggressive and productive because their university was unknown. Had they started their careers at a traditional university they would have automatically been respected. But having an initial fear that their scholarly reputations were at stake, they worked harder. The recent creation of a university press seemed a reward for these labors. No longer did anyone view his or her reputation in jeopardy.

The strength of these young scholars in the absence of older professors has led to another striking development. Some people have now come to feel that there is no need for the rank or role of the professor. Some wonder why a professor should be hired at twice the salary to teach less and produce research which is no more distinguished than that of younger scholars. Such feelings led historian Jes Adolphsen to observe that the young Danish scholar was now in less awe of professorial authority than any other European academic. Such sentiments about the role of the professor were made at Aalborg and elsewhere in 1977. In these new times of budgetary restraint there is greater financial pressure to restrict the number of professors--an obvious argument to reinforce the views of those who would eliminate the rank. It will be interesting to see in the future if this sentiment against the rank of professor grows and if a satisfying career structure can be developed without prestigious positions at the top.

Not all faculties at Aalborg were so enthusiastic about the potential demise of the professor. In the engineering institutes it was emphasized that professors were necessary to give authority to a technical discipline.

But such a comment in no way signified a return to tradition in engineering education. Engineering at Aalborg continues to be one of its most innovative units.

Aalborg was the first university in Scandinavia where engineering was taught in the same institution with other disciplines. It was also the first place to teach engineering with a basic introductory course in technology and science, followed with upper division project-oriented courses. Previously engineering had been taught as a set curriculum of specified courses. This innovative prgram is still strong, though engineer Ole Kristiansen admitted that it was taking longer than many had expected to arrive at a proper balance between the basic course, project orientation and technical skill.

The success of this innovation is particularly striking given the conservative, tradition-bound nature of engineering education. Kristiansen noted that he had not welcomed the project-oriented curriculum when it came to Aalborg. He said he had often felt the need for more problem-solving ability among engineers, but he had become so accustomed to a traditionally structured set of courses that he was not disposed to deviate from this. However, once he started teaching the new curriculum, he became enthusiastic about it; he was now teaching students in a manner which he had long felt would improve the quality of an engineer.

This same problem of breaking the resistance of tradition has been experienced in placing graduates of Aalborg's program. Kristiansen said that the largest engineering firms still resist taking Aalborg graudates because their personnel departments have rigid policies regarding specific courses and diploma requirements. Aalborg's innovative curriculum does not fit their bureaucratic guidelines. More success has been achieved in placing graduates with smaller firms who do their hiring in a less formal manner and who may possibly be attracted to a less traditionally trained engineer. But

Kristiansen stressed that Aalborg engineers certainly had the technical ability to join any firm.

Certain types of firms have been attracted to the program at Aalborg; a similar self-selecting process has occurred in the kind of students who take the Aalborg course. Those who like the project approach choose Aalborg; those who prefer the traditional curriculum have other institutions in Denmark to choose from. Thus the innovative course is not in danger of reverting to a traditional curriculum. One could well say that Aalborg has singlehandedly effected an innovation in engineering education in Scandinavia and made possible a choice in educational paths to produce a high quality technical engineer.

One part of the transformation of engineering at Aalborg has not met with total success and should be noted. When the existing Aalborg Engineering Academy and the local Teknikum were incorporated into the university center, faculty members from these units who had previously done no university level research found themsleves governed by the national statute which prescribed that a university teacher's time should be apportioned by the scale 50% teaching, 40% research and 10% administration. Kristiansen noted that some of these teachers had not adapted well to research. But he hoped it would be possible to achieve the 50:40:10 split as a general proportion throughout the institute. Thus some could do mainly teaching and others mainly research. This may explain the greater need in engineering to recruit professors to strengthen the research component.

At Aalborg different institutes have achieved strength and innovation by differing means. In the arts and humanities young faculty members have assembled and found a remarkable esprit de corps in both the newness and the relative isolation of Aalborg. In the absence of professorial authority some have even advocated a substantial de-emphasis of the professor in the

hierarchical order. In engineering faculty members of different ages and levels of experience, many of whom had been at Aalborg for years, have adopted to new methods of teaching and organization while desiring to retain some features of authority in the old structure. Possibly the overall strength of Aalborg comes from the fact that these different institutes have been allowed to work out different structures suited to their own disciplinary needs and the temperament of their members. Less success might have been achieved if one model had been forced on all.

Though adaptation to specific needs within the institutes seems to be one key to Aalborg's success, there is another aspect of the university's development which seems to argue just the opposite case. People at Aalborg, both in 1977 and 1979, have continually commented that a university center with an innovative curriculum was not at all the kind of institution which the population of northern Jutland desired. In this conservative area many people had wished for a traditional university out of the 1950's--as one person remarked "complete with long-bearded professors and docile students." So Aalborg is still seen by many within and without the university as the experiment conceived in Copenhagen which was forced on Aalborg. Yet this institution which was not what the people wanted has thus far met with remarkable success. One can well wonder if the university would have been more or less successful if regional authorities had been allowed to design an institution which "fit their needs." Would they have constructed a better institution or would they have found themselves bogged down in perpetual arguing over what they needed? Possibly the imposed structure from the outside saved valuable time in the initial organization. These questions, I believe, are still open for debate.

A return to Aalborg after twenty months certainly confirmed the view of stability which was emerging in the fall of 1977. Still, it is clear

that Aalborg is not exactly the same institution it was then. It has continued to experiment with new programs, and one can only imagine that this experimental process will go on for some time into the future. The final form which the university will take is still in the process of being determined.

Conclusion

The crisis of the 1970's seems to be at an end in Denmark. Are there now any problems in Danish higher education? Despite the surface calm, one problem seems to haunt people at all universities. That problem is the job market and its ability to absorb the universities' graduates. Traditionally degrees from Danish universities have been carefully tied to entry into the civil service and the professions. And this tradition was in no way altered by the legislation or student demands of the early 1970's. It is now feared that graduates in those disciplines which have customarily provided teachers for Danish secondary schools-particularly the arts and the humanities--will soon be unable to find jobs. The potential frustration from unemployed graduates would be particularly high in Denmark because 1) the first degree often requires seven years of study and 2) a degree in one program cannot be easily transferred to entry into another job; other degree programs jealously guard entry into those jobs. For example, an English degree could not be easily used to enter the newspaper world because those jobs are guarded by journalism programs. A history degree could not be easily transferred to an administrative post in the civil service as those jobs are carefully controlled by law degrees. Thus an easy transferability which might occur in some countries is not so feasible in Denmark.

While almost everyone forsees this crisis, no one could point to any plan for facing it. The new organizational structure of the universities

is no better equipped to handle this than the old professorial model. Erik Hansen at Aarhus even suggested that participatory government has brought a new conservatism to the university. He noted that the study and institute boards chip away at the curriculum and make minor administrative adjustments, but they do not think "imaginatively" about long range solutions to broad scale problems. If the potential for change does not come from within the university, where will it come from? Some see, both in a positive and a negative manner, that the Ministry of Education or Parliament, may one day have to intervene to adjust the degree programs if pressure is exerted by students who are distressed at the thought of spending seven years of time and money for a degree with minimal job prospects. No one really knows when or if the job crisis will occur. It obviously depends on many variable factors. Will entering students anticipate the crisis and choose disciplines which do not lead to teaching jobs thus eliminating the pressure? Or will they demand jobs from the programs they prefer to take? Will the world economy expand or contract thus making Denmark more or less able to provide jobs? What the outcome will be is uncertain. At the moment the strategy is to watch and wait.

So problems have gone and problems may come. In looking back over the last fifteen years and in looking forward to the future is there any striking trend or change in Danish higher education which can help us put these past and potential events in a continuous perspective? To some extent there is. The anticipation of the future job crisis is illustrative of the Danes' new sense that events occurring outside the walls of their universities will have a dramatic effect on the activities inside their universities. In the mid-60's this sense simply did not exist. At that time Danish universities were almost oblivious to the outside society. The reverse was also true; neither the Parliament, the newspapers, nor the political parties paid particular attention

to the universities. To some people this signified the strength of, and the respect for, something called "the traditional autonomy of the university." This sense of autonomy extended beyond the simple right of self-governance. Some felt that no outside body had the right to influence, much less intervere in, the affairs of the university. This autonomy was viewed by some as a necessary ingredient of university life--something descended from the middle ages and roughly synonomous with truth and learning. Without it intellectual life might die.

By 1977 most academics had seen that the outside world could intrude into the university, but many were still unsure of what their reaction should be. At that time there was talk again of the need to preserve "the traditional autnonomy of the university"--particularly by those who did not like the changes. For them intellectual life was at a crossroads; the relation between the universities and society was out of its proper alignment.

In 1979 one heard much less talk about the loss of traditional autonomy or that such a loss signified an end to intellectual life. More and more academics viewed the intrusion of the outside world as a given factor in daily life. Once could sense this feeling in Roskilde's acceptance of the external rektorat, in Aalborg's accomodation to the fact that its institutional form was conceived in Copenhagen, and in the anticipation at most universities that the job crisis could bring new disruptions. While some complained of the inroads made by the Ministry of Education, they usually noted that, after all, the Ministry was only responding to Parliament, and that Parliament was only responding to public pressure about expenditures and jobs. The "traditional autonomy" was not being besieged by specific, identifiable, anti-intellectual groups, but by the more impersonal forces of national growth and budgetary restraints. And few believed that these outside forces would go away in the forseeable future.

Why has there been such acquiescence to what seemed so extraordinary and fearful only a few years ago? In looking back over the last fifteen years, most people acknowledged that Danish universities had expanded and advanced to take a more prominent and visible place in society. And most people were strongly in favor of this new position. To them the "outside world" as a permanent factor in the internal activities of the universities was now seen as simply the natural price to be paid for such new prominence.

Thus we could say that the "traditional autonomy of the university" was part of one historic form of organization peculiar to a small university system catering to an elite portion of society. As systems expand this historic organization may change quite naturally. The Danish experience tends to point in this direction. And in Denmark intellectual life has continued at a high level despite the decline of this version of autonomy. In light of this, observers of higher education might well want to re-examine the emphasis given to this "traditional autonomy" in other countries, separate its intellectual from its organizational aspects, and consider if it is an absolute ingredient of university life or merely an historic one.

People Interviewed Summer 1979

Paul Lyngbye
International Office
Royal Ministry of Education
Copenhagen

Lise Lorder Hansen
Moderate Students League
Copenhagen University

Professor Jørgen Sevaldsen
English Institute
Copenhagen University

Mr. Csaba Chikes
U.S. Embassy
Copenhagen

Mr. John Hamilton
U.S. Embassy
Copenhagen

Professor Thomas Webb
Roskilde University Center

Professor Erik Arne Hansen
English Institute
Aarhus University

Sven Caspersen
Rector, Aalborg University Center

Professor Jes B. Adolphsen
Aalborg University Center

Professor Gunhild Agger
Aalborg University Center

Professor Ole Kristiansen
Aalborg University Center

Professor Steen Sverdrup Jensen
Aalborg University Center

(See YHERG Working Paper 32 for list of people interviewed in Fall 1977)

INSTITUTION FOR SOCIAL AND POLICY STUDIES

The mission of the Institution for Social and Policy Studies (ISPS) is to encourage and undertake multidisciplinary research and education. The ISPS is oriented to the exploration of social problems rather than to the refinement of discipline-based methodology. In recent years, ISPS research has focused on the problems of the city, education, health service delivery, and on the modeling of social systems. Currently, research is also being developed on criminal justice, governmental reform, environment, income distribution, aging, the policy-making process, and value problems in public policy. ISPS is not a consulting organization but an instrument for enriching the social sciences and related disciplines in the University.

Higher Education Research Group
Institution for Social and Policy Studies
1732 Yale Station
New Haven, Connecticut 06520